

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-5 and 7-18 have been canceled. Amended claims 1 and 6, and new claim 19 are in this application.

Claim 6 was objected to because of an informality. In explaining this objection, the Examiner indicated that line 26 of page 4 reads second time "so as request" and it is believed that this phrase is supposed to be "so as to request".

Claim 6 as presented herein incorporates the change suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above objection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In explaining the above 112 rejection and as best understood, the Examiner requires that the claims be rewritten so as not to be in means plus function form or that the specification be amended to link structure to the claimed functions.

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the present application identified structure for claimed functions for the claims as previously presented. However, each of the independent claims has been amended herein. It is respectfully submitted that such amended claims satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above 112 rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,106 ("Okamoto").

Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended herein. As a result and as an example, amended claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"a first central processing unit (CPU) to cause the user identification information and the device identification information for the respective electronic device, and software identification information for selected software, to be sent to the server to request that the selected software be provided; to cause the selected software provided from the server to be installed after the user identification information and the device identification information for the respective electronic device, and the software identification information for the selected software, has been sent to the server; to cause the software identification information for the installed software, the user identification information, and the device identification information for the respective electronic device to be sent to the server so as to request that a license required to run the selected software be generated based on predetermined license generating information and be provided to the electronic device; to cause the selected software to be run using the license; to cause information to be supplied to the respective electronic device which identifies each electronic device currently available to receive the selected software by transfer if a request to do so is made; and to cause a request that the server transfer the selected software from the respective electronic device to another of the at least two electronic devices which has the same user associated therewith as that of the respective electronic device and which is selected by use of the information which identifies said each electronic device currently available to receive the selected software by transfer; and" (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1 (and claim 6). With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to Steps S31, S32, and S33 of Fig. 9 and paragraphs 0059, 0064, and 0066 of the present application.

In explaining the above 103 rejection and as best understood, the Examiner appears to acknowledge that Okamoto does not disclose sending software identification information,

user identification information, and the device identification information to the server a second time. (See sections 32 and 33 of the present Office Action.)

In the system of claim 1, "the user identification information and the device identification information for the respective electronic device, and software identification information for selected software" are sent to the server to request that the selected software be provided; and "the software identification information for the installed software, the user identification information, and the device identification information" are sent to the server to request that a license required to run the selected software be generated. (Emphasis added.) It should be noted that in-between these two features, the software may be actually installed in the respective electronic device. (As an example thereof, see items S31, S32, and S33 of Fig. 9 of the present application.) Therefore, information may be sent to the server to request that selected software be provided, thereafter the selected software may be actually provided, and thereafter information which may include information pertaining to the installed software may be sent to the server. It is respectfully submitted that Okamoto as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose such features as now specifically recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from the Okamoto as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 6 is also distinguishable from Okamoto as applied by the Examiner.

New independent claim 19 has been added herein.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 11, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Dennis M.  
Smid, Esq./  
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.  
Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant(s)